

## PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &amp; GARRISON LLP

1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019-6064

TELEPHONE (212) 373-3000

LLOYD K. GARRISON (1946-1991)  
RANDOLPH E. PAUL (1946-1956)  
SIMON H. RIFKIND (1950-1995)  
LOUIS S. WEISS (1927-1950)  
JOHN F. WHARTON (1927-1977)

UNIT 3601, OFFICE TOWER A, BEIJING FORTUNE PLAZA  
NO. 7 DONGSANHUA ZHONGLU  
CHAOWANG DISTRICT  
BEIJING 100020  
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA  
TELEPHONE (86-10) 5828-6300

12TH FLOOR, HONG KONG CLUB BUILDING  
3A CHATER ROAD, CENTRAL  
HONG KONG  
TELEPHONE (852) 2846-0300

ALDER CASTLE  
10 NOBLE STREET  
LONDON EC2V 7JU, U.K.  
TELEPHONE (44 20) 7367 1600

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

(212) 373-3165

WRITER'S DIRECT FACSIMILE

(212) 492-0165

WRITER'S DIRECT E-MAIL ADDRESS

bbirenboim@paulweiss.com

FUKOKU SEIMEI BUILDING  
2-2 UCHISAIWAICHO 2-CHOME  
CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 100-0011, JAPAN  
TELEPHONE (81-3) 3597-8101

TORONTO-DOMINION CENTRE  
77 KING STREET WEST, SUITE 3100  
P.O. BOX 226  
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5K 1J3  
TELEPHONE (416) 504-0520

2001 K STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1047  
TELEPHONE (202) 223-7300

500 DELAWARE AVENUE, SUITE 200  
POST OFFICE BOX 32  
WILMINGTON, DE 19899-0032  
TELEPHONE (302) 655-4410

MATTHEW W. ABBOTT  
EDWARD T. ACKERMAN  
JACOB A. ADLERSTEIN  
ALLAN J. ARFFA  
ROBERT A. ATKINS  
DAVID J. BALL  
SCOTT A. BARSHAY  
JOHN F. BAUGHMAN  
LYNN B. BAYARD  
DANIEL J. BELLER  
CRAIG A. BENSON  
MITCHELL L. BERG  
MARK S. BERGMAN  
BRUCE BIRENBOIM  
H. CHRISTOPHER BOEHNING  
ANGELO BONVINO  
JAMES L. BROCHIN  
RICHARD J. BRONSTEIN  
DAVID W. BROWN  
SUSANNA M. BUERGEL  
PATRICK S. CAMPBELL  
JESSICA S. CAREY  
JEANETTE K. CHAN  
GEOFFREY R. CHEPIGA  
ELLEN N. CHING  
WILLIAM A. CLAREMAN  
LEWIS R. CLAYTON  
JAY COHEN  
KELLEY A. CORNISH  
CHRISTOPHER J. CUMMINGS  
CHARLES E. DAVIDOW  
THOMAS V. DE LA BASTIDE III  
ARIEL J. DECKELBAUM  
ALICE BELISLE EATON  
ANDREW J. EHRLICH  
GREGORY A. EZRING  
LESLIE GORDON FAGEN  
MARC FALCONE  
ROSS A. FIELDSTON  
ANDREW C. FINCH  
BRAD J. FINKELSTEIN  
BRIAN P. FINNIGAN  
ROBERTO FINZI  
PETER E. FISCH  
ROBERT C. FLEDER  
MARTIN FLUMENBAUM  
ANDREW J. FOLEY  
HARRIS B. FREIDUS  
MANUEL S. FREY  
ANDREW L. GAINES  
KENNETH A. GALLO  
MICHAEL E. GERTZMAN  
ADAM M. GIVERTZ  
SALVATORE GOGLIORMELLA  
ROBERT D. GOLDBAUM  
NEIL GOLDMAN  
ROBERTO J. GONZALEZ  
CATHERINE L. GOODALL  
ERIC GOODISON  
CHARLES H. GOOGE, JR.  
ANDREW G. GORDON  
UDI GROFMAN  
NICHOLAS GROOMBRIDGE  
BRUCE A. GUTENPLAN  
GAINES GWATHMEY, III  
ALAN S. HALPERIN  
JUSTIN G. HAMILL  
CLAUDIA HAMMERMAN  
BRIAN S. HERMANN  
MICHELE HIRSHMAN  
MICHAEL S. HONG  
DAVID S. HUNTINGTON  
AMRAN HUSSEIN  
LORETTA A. IPPOLITO  
BRIAN M. JANSON  
JAREN JANGHORBANI

MEREDITH J. KANE  
ROBERTA A. KAPLAN  
BRAD S. KARP  
PATRICK N. KARSNITZ  
JOHN C. KENNEDY  
BRIAN KIM  
ALAN W. KORNBERG  
DANIEL J. KRAMER  
DAVID K. LAKHODHIR  
STEPHEN P. LAMBS  
JOHN E. LANGE  
GREGORY F. LAUFER  
DANIEL J. LEFFELL  
XIAOYU GREG LIU  
JEFFREY D. MARELL  
MARCO V. MASOTTI  
EDWIN S. MAYNARD  
DAVID W. MAYO  
ELIZABETH R. MCCOLM  
MARK F. MENDELSON  
CLAUDINE MEREDITH-GOUJON  
WILLIAM B. MICHAEL  
TOBY S. MYERSON  
JUDIE NG SHORTELL  
CATHERINE NYARADY  
JANE B. O'BRIEN  
ALEX YOUNG K. OH  
BRAD R. OKUN  
KELLEY D. PARKER  
MARC E. PERLMUTTER  
VALERIE E. RADWANE  
CARL L. REISNER  
LORIN L. REISNER  
WALTER G. RICCIARDI  
WALTER RIEMAN  
RICHARD A. ROSEN  
ANDREW N. ROSENBERG  
JACQUELINE P. RUBIN  
RAPHAEL M. RUSSO  
ELIZABETH M. SACKSTEDER  
JEFFREY O. SAFERSTEIN  
JEFFREY B. SAMUELS  
DALE M. SARRO  
TERRY E. SCHIMEK  
KENNETH M. SCHNEIDER  
ROBERT B. SCHUMER  
JOHN M. SCOTT  
STEPHEN J. SHIMSHAK  
DAVID R. SIGULAR  
MOSES SILVERMAN  
STEVEN SIMKIN  
JOSEPH J. SIMONS  
AUDRA J. SOLOWAY  
SCOTT M. SONTAG  
TARUN M. STEWART  
ERIC ALAN STONE  
AIDAN SYNNOTT  
ROBYN F. TARNOWSKY  
MONICA K. THURMOND  
DANIEL J. TOAL  
LIZA M. VELAZQUEZ  
LAWRENCE G. WEE  
THEODORE V. WELLS, JR.  
STEVEN J. WILLIAMS  
LAWRENCE I. WITDORCHIC  
MARK B. WLAZLO  
JULIA MASON WOOD  
JENNIFER H. WU  
BETTY YAP  
JORDAN E. YARETT  
KAYE N. YOSHINO  
TONG YU  
TRACEY A. ZACCONE  
TAURIE M. ZEITZER  
T. ROBERT ZOCHOWSKI, JR.

\*NOT ADMITTED TO THE NEW YORK BAR

May 6, 2016

By ECF

Honorable Anita B. Brody  
United States District Court  
Eastern District of Pennsylvania  
James A. Byrne U.S. Courthouse  
601 Market Street, Room 7613  
Philadelphia PA, 19106

*Smith, et al., v. Arizona Football Club, LLC, 16-cv-01704*

Dear Judge Brody:

We write on behalf of the Arizona Cardinals Football Club, LLC (the "Cardinals") concerning the motion to remand (the "Motion") filed on April 19, 2016 by Plaintiffs in the above-captioned action pending in *In re National Football League Players' Concussion Injury Litigation* ("MDL 2323"). For the reasons set forth below, the Motion is procedurally improper and premature. Accordingly, the Cardinals respectfully request that it be denied without prejudice at this time or, at the least, held in abeyance until the Court issues a case management order permitting and scheduling supplemental briefing on all or certain preemption-related motions in the Opt Out litigation.

Honorable Anita B. Brody

2

First, Plaintiffs already filed a motion to remand prior to MDL transfer that is pending before this Court. (*See* 4:15-cv-01903 (E.D. Mo), Doc. Nos. 16-17.) Filing a successive motion seeking the same relief as a motion that remains pending before the Court is improper. *See, e.g., UFCW Local 880-Retail Food Emp'rs Joint Pension Fund v. Newmont Mining Corp.*, 2007 WL 2871013, at \*5 (D. Colo. Sept. 26, 2007) (“[Proposed intervenor] proffers no explanation as to why it had a good faith legal basis to file repetitive motions seeking the same relief that remained *sub judice* as a result of its first request for entry of default.”), *aff'd*, 276 F. App'x 747 (10th Cir. 2008); *see also Scott v. Cunningham*, 2012 WL 1536312, at \*8 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 12, 2012) (“[T]he case represents an example of abusive pleading practice where multiple motions are filed asking for the same relief and the plaintiff does not wait for a response from the court before filing the same motion again. Motion practice of this nature cannot be for a proper purpose and only delays and increases the cost of litigation.”), *aff'd*, 516 F. App'x 672 (9th Cir. 2013). Here, Plaintiffs do not contest—nor could they—that their motion to remand was pending at the time they filed the Motion. The already pending motion argues that the actions should be remanded to state court because there is no federal jurisdiction on the basis of Section 301 Labor Management Relations Act preemption—the same argument made in the instant Motion. Thus, the Motion should be denied without prejudice at the outset as duplicative of a pending motion.

Second, the Motion—filed by the same counsel who represent plaintiffs suing the Kansas City Chiefs in four substantially similar actions pending in MDL 2323—ignores that this Court issued an order in the Chiefs actions which requested that counsel *first* brief the issue of whether the Court should hear plaintiffs’ remand motions before or at the same time that it hears the preemption issues raised in the NFL Defendants’ motion to dismiss. (*See* 12-md-02323, Doc No. 6705.) The Court issued a notice which clarified that only *after* the Court decides the timing issue will the parties be required to brief the substance of the remand arguments. (*See id.*, Doc. No. 6710.) Instead of alerting the Court that Plaintiffs seek joinder of this action on that pending briefing, the Motion instead seeks to skip ahead to the substantive briefing and further uses its introduction as a sur-reply to argue why the Court should expedite its consideration of the Cardinals and Chiefs remand motions. Again, this is plainly improper.

Third, the Motion concedes that the transfer of Plaintiffs’ action to MDL 2323 will promote the just and efficient conduct of the multidistrict litigation. (*See* Motion at 2 (“The United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, however, found that transfer of this action would likely promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation. Upon further consideration, Plaintiffs agree.”).) By filing a new remand motion, however, Plaintiffs are interfering with this Court’s effort to administer the MDL proceedings in an orderly fashion. It is incontestable that the Court has broad discretion to manage its docket in a fashion intended to maximize judicial efficiency and minimize burden on the parties. *See In re Asbestos Prods. Liab. Litig. (No. VI)*, 718 F.3d 236, 243 (3d Cir. 2013) (“[D]istrict judges ‘must have authority to manage their dockets, especially during a massive litigation’” (quoting *In re Fannie Mae Sec. Litig.*, 552 F.3d



Honorable Anita B. Brody

3

814, 822-23 (D.C. Cir. 2009)); *see also In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1232 (9th Cir. 2006) (stating that district courts managing multidistrict litigation cases need “to have broad discretion to administer the proceeding as a whole, which necessarily includes keeping the parts in line”). There is no reason for Plaintiffs’ motion to depart from coordinated management of the Court’s docket (including the Chiefs actions)—the very purpose of having an MDL.

To achieve those goals, as set forth in the Chiefs’ responsive briefing (12-md-02323, Doc. No. 6719), supplemental briefing on the motions to remand should be coordinated with supplemental briefing on the NFL Parties’ pending motion to dismiss the other cases pending before the Court in this MDL proceeding. As Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Support of their Motion illustrates, both motions—despite involving different defendants—will require the Court to consider substantially overlapping arguments concerning provisions of the NFL Collective Bargaining Agreements and Section 301 Labor Management Relations Act case law. The coordination of supplemental briefing (and argument) on preemption-related motions would be consistent with the Court’s intent to prioritize and coordinate the resolution of related motions while maintaining structured, efficient MDL proceedings. It would also be consistent with the Court’s June 13, 2012 order that stayed “[t]he time for NFL Defendants and Riddell Defendants to respond to any motion to remand . . . until further order from this Court.” (Order at 1, 12-md-02323, Doc. No. 89.) By staying those responses, the Court recognized then that it would be inefficient to address preemption-related motion practice in piecemeal fashion. The same holds true for the instant Motion.

In sum, the Cardinals respectfully request that the Motion be denied without prejudice as procedurally improper at this time or held in abeyance until the Court issues a case management order permitting and scheduling supplemental briefing on all or certain preemption-related motions in the Opt Out litigation. At such time, the Cardinals respectfully request the right to submit an opposition brief on the merits of the motion on a briefing schedule agreed to by the parties or ordered by the Court.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce Birenboim

Cc: Kenneth B. McClain (via ECF)  
Lauren E. McClain (via ECF)  
John M. Klamann (via ECF)  
Andrew Schermerhorn (via ECF)  
Paul D. Anderson (via ECF)  
Patrick R. Dowd (via ECF)  
Timothy J. Kingsbury (via ECF)  
William D. Vandever (via ECF)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

It is hereby certified that a true copy of the foregoing document was served electronically via the Court's electronic filing system on the 6th day of May, 2016, upon all counsel of record.

Dated: May 6, 2016

/s/ Bruce Birenboim  
Bruce Birenboim